

IV. Remarks and Arguments

The status of the claims is set forth in the above listing of the claims. Claims 1-25 and 45 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 26-44 and 46-50 remain pending in the present application. Claims 36-46 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 26, 35-43 and 47 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. PGPub. 2003/0115366 (“Robinson”). Claims 27-32, 34, 44-46, and 48-50 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Robinson as applied to claims 26, 36, and 47, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,429 (“Todd”). Claim 33 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Robinson in view of Todd as applied to claim 28, and further in view of U.S. PGPub 2001/0047385 (“Tuatini”). Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, Applicant has proposed the above indicated amendments for independent claims 26, 36, and 47 to expedite the allowance of the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

A. Rejection under 35 USC §112

Claims 36-46 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Independent claim 36 as amended recites “A **computer**-readable medium embodying a sequence of instructions that, when executed by a **computer**, causes the **computer** to perform operations comprising...” Subsequent dependent claims 37-44 and 46 as amended also recite “**computer**-readable medium,”

thus particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

B. Rejection under 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 26, 35-43 and 47 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. PGPub. 2003/0115366 (“Robinson”). Independent claims 26, 36, and 47 as amended recite “processing the message according to a second messaging paradigm, **wherein the processing the message according to a second messaging paradigm comprises routing the message to at least one bridged destination and determining whether the at least one bridged destination is configured to receive the message.**”

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the independent claims have rendered the rejections asserted under 35 USC §102(e) in the Office Action moot. Robinson does not teach the processing the message according to a second messaging paradigm comprises routing the message to at least one bridged destination and determining whether the at least one bridged destination is configured to receive the message. Applicant respectfully reiterates the fact that the Office Action of June 23, 2008 has acknowledged that Robinson “*does not teach the processing the message according to the second messaging paradigm comprises routing the message to at least one bridged destination...*” The Office Action of June 23, 2008 further acknowledged that Robinson “*does not teach the processing the message according to the second messaging paradigm further comprises determining whether the at least one bridged destination is configured to receive the message.*” Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claims 26, 36 and 47 are patentably distinct over the cited art.

C. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a)

Applicant respectfully submits that the aforementioned amendments to the independent claims have rendered the obviousness rejections asserted in the Office Action moot. As discussed above, Robinson does not teach the processing the message according to a second messaging paradigm comprises routing the message to at least one bridged destination and determining whether the at least one bridged destination is configured to receive the message. Additionally, Todd does not teach determining whether the at least one bridged destination is configured to receive the message.

In the Office Action of June 23, 2008, Examiner cites Col. 5 lines 46-55 of Todd, asserting *“Todd teach[es] the relational message broker placing the message in the appropriate output queues; therefore the bridged destination is permitted to receive the message since the user is a subscriber of the topic.”*¹ Applicant respectfully opposes Examiner’s assertion.

According to Todd, the relational message broker *“processes the messages... and sends them back to the queue manager for placing in the output queues of the appropriate subscribers where they can be retrieved by the subscribers.”*² Applicant respectfully submits that the message broker does not place the messages in the output queues, but rather returns them to the queue manager, wherein the queue manager places the messages in the appropriate output queues. Furthermore, Todd states that the *“queue manager... takes care of all necessary data format translations (e.g., protocols etc.) to allow the publisher and subscriber to communicate with each other in an asynchronous*

¹ See Office Action of June 23, 2008, ¶47.

² See Todd, Col. 5 lines 49-53.

manner.”³ Therefore, management of the output queues is managed by the queue manager, and not the relational message broker.

Again, Applicant respectfully asserts that Todd does not teach determining whether the at least one bridged destination is configured to receive the message. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 26, 36, and 47 are patentably distinct over the cited art.

Dependent claims 27-35, 37-44, 46, and 48-50 depend on respective claims 26, 36, and 47 or intervening claims. Since these claims further limit the independent claims that are believed to be allowable, the dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

³ See Todd, Col. 5 lines 28-31.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If any additional fees are required to complete this filing, or if an overpayment has occurred, the Director is authorized to charge or credit such amount to Deposit Account No. 13-0480, referencing Attorney Docket No. TIB-015. Examiner is invited to please contact the undersigned Attorney of Record if such would expedite the prosecution of this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Penny L. Lowry/

Date: September 23, 2008

Penny L. Lowry, Reg. No. 57,186
Attorney for Applicants
BAKER & McKENZIE LLP
2300 Trammell Crow Center
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201
Phone: 214-965-7013
Fax: 214-965-5922